

Reply-To: bu.edu!INFO-HAMS@WSMR-SIMTEL20.ARMY.MIL
Subject: INFO-HAMS Digest V89 #949
To: INFO-HAMS@WSMR-SIMTEL20.ARMY.MIL

INFO-HAMS Digest Wed, 29 Nov 89 Volume 89 : Issue 949

Today's Topics:

(#1 in series) Listen to store secu
 (none)
 Contests
FCC don't keep the info! that's pre
 FCC monitoring law
 iambic keyer question
 LISTENING BELONGS IN SWL
 Modification Info
Over-voltage protection for mobiles.
 Part 15
 The "Right to Receive"
 Weather Facsimile Reception
What's a good "FCC class B" PC/AT c

Date: 30 Nov 89 01:32:24 GMT
From: dino!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!phil@uunet.uu.net
Subject: (#1 in series) Listen to store secu
Message-ID: <30500305@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

> From: Jim.Grubs@f1.n234.z1.fidonet.org
> > From: tad@ssc.UUCP (Tad Cook)
...
> > over there by telling a lot of prospective hams that checking out a
> > piece of ham gear ON THE AIR before buying it was a federal crime,
> > because there was obvious pecuniary interest! (In the examples being
...
> It is NOT legal, Tad. Darin Arrick asked if it is legal. I replied by quoting
> Part 97, to wit:
>
> S 97.113 Prohibited transmissions.
> (a) No amateur station shall transmit any communication the
> purpose of which is to facilitate the business or commercial
> affairs of any party. No station shall transmit communications as

I believe it is ***LEGAL*** and here is why.....

The keyword is "communication". That is referring to the content of the communication. If use the radio to actually talk to the salesman and ask him the price, or otherwise discuss the potential transaction, then the actual communication, that is to say, the CONTENT of the transmission, is

pertaining to the business at hand. That is not legal as I understand 97.113.

However, if the actual communication is nothing more than simple amateur communication, such as "This is KA9WGN testing" (something legal to do in any other setting) then I believe that the COMMUNICATION was legal because it had no bearing on the business at hand. I would be conducting an ordinary amateur transmission/communication while at the same time also observing the correct function of the equipment to determine if it suits my needs.

Others will argue that if I was not actually conducting the business, I would not have made that transmission, and therefore it did facilitate my business. My argument is that the loaning of the equipment to my portable station was the act of facilitating my business, and now that I have (for however brief a time) this equipment in my station, I want to determine if it operates in a suitable and legal manner. The facilitation of my business is incidental to the communication.

That's where I stand on the issue. Since I am not a lawyer (and am not trained or educated in law), you may consider my opinion worthless, and it certainly is not legal advice. It's what I would do, and you know how many things YOU do which you never consult a lawyer about anyway.

--Phil Howard, KA9WGN--
<phil@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

Date: 30 Nov 89 01:39:04 GMT
From: zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!gem.mps.ohio-state.edu!uakari.prima.wisc.edu!
uwm.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!phil@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu
Subject: (none)
Message-ID: <30500308@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

> >very restrictive gun laws,
> True, thank goodness - and a murder rate a fraction of the U.S. as a
> result.

England also has a much more homogenous population, with far fewer people who can be so easily discriminated against

> >an oppressive "Big Brother"-type government,
> Where did you get this? If Thatcher were any more in agreement with
> Reagan she'd have divorced Denis & married him.. She even got him a
> knighthood! (given by the queen, but put forward by the P.M.)

That's probably just a summation of the other feelings about England

> >and now I find out this: you cannot even listen to radio waves

> >passing through your own body!
> Actually, I agree with you on this one, unfortunately it seems that
> the U.S. is going the same way.

and of course we are trying to reverse that trend.

> Re Greenpeace:

>
> This probably ran afoul of the paid political ad laws. Here in the U.S.,
> the 'speech' of political ads is NOT 'free' - its bought & paid for.
> This means that the party with the most money gets the most T.V. time,
> and gets the attention of the masses, & presumably their votes. In
> England, TV political ads ARE free - i.e. the broadcasters have to give
> free time for political ads, and every party gets their share - even the
> loonies on left & right. A fairer system IMHO. It means you have to
> be fairly strict about what constitutes a political ad, or everyone
> else would cry foul...

I agree with that system. I like that. By why is it that Greepeace is
still not allowed its position on the air?

> I now return to the regularly scheduled discussion of shoplifting,
> pizza, BARF, gun laws, free speech, and, maybe, ham radio.....

Don't forget, cigarette ads are banned from radio and TV in the USA.

--Phil Howard, KA9WGN--
<phil@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

Date: 29 Nov 89 18:0:28
From: David Waters <David_Waters.M1@smtp.ESL.COM>
Subject: Contests
Message-ID: <8911300203.AA28885@esl.ESL.COM>

Contests
LEY@UWSTOUT.BITNET ("James P. Ley") writes:
>ARF says:
 <comments here>
> CONTESTS ARE FOR MUSH-BRAINS

I say: 5-9 California, thanks! QRZ?

David Waters, WA6AWZ
Internet: David_Waters.M1@smtp.ESL.COM

Date: 30 Nov 89 01:38:56 GMT
From: zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!gem.mps.ohio-state.edu!uakari.primate.wisc.edu!
uwm.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!phil@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu
Subject: FCC don't keep the info! that's pre
Message-ID: <30500307@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

I have kept all my licenses. I will need my first TECH one since it proves that I am TECH(1) instead of TECH(2), where 1 is the one that already passed the General written. CSC's expire in 1 year, but because I was issued a license based on that exam, my credit for it is infinite (and someday I will make use of it). Obviously a copy of that will have to go to the FCC since they don't have any records (apparently) of that.

--Phil Howard, KA9WGN--
<phil@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

Date: 29 Nov 89 19:22:19 GMT
From: orion.oac.uci.edu!uci-ics!turner@ucsd.edu (Clark Turner)
Subject: FCC monitoring law
Message-ID: <25742C6C.28070@paris.ics.uci.edu>

In article <1104@mit-amt.MEDIA.MIT.EDU> castillo@media-lab.media.mit.edu (Brian Anderson) writes:

>In article <8739@cbmvax.UUCP> sterling@cbmvax.UUCP (Rick Sterling - QA) writes:
>>

>>My personal opinion is that anything other than the rules set forth in the
>>Communications Act of 1934 would be unenforcible and probably
>>unconstitutional.

>>

>Of course that didn't stop Congress from passing just such a law. The
>.....

..... but it will provide furthur
>employment for additional attorneys (which is just what this country
>needs to become more competitive in the international electronics
>marketplace :-)

Here, Here!

And then there are the attorneys (we'll never know how many they number, they aren't the ones "in the headlines" or hired by the "large firms" to do the "important" work...) who see this ECPA for the nonsense that it is, don't have the independent wealth to go out and challenge it, and don't have the clients with the independent wealth to go out and challenge it, and besides, are just struggling to pay for the FT 470 they just purchased on their VISA

card.

Perchance, if anyone gets into a jam with this law, please post the info so that such attorneys (and other interested parties) can come together in some sort of networking group to (hopefully) set this thing straight eventually.....the same should be said for the NJ scanner law - if anyone knows of a case or an attorney involved, maybe we all ought to know so that we can have some input if it is needed.

Clark S. Turner
WA3JPG
turner@ics.uci.edu

"When the going gets weird,
the weird turn pro."
-Hunter Thompson

Date: 29 Nov 89 21:16:42 GMT
From: usc!henry.jpl.nasa.gov!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!forsight!robotics.jpl.nasa.gov!
katzmann@ucsd.edu
Subject: iambic keyer question
Message-ID: <374@forsight.Jpl.Nasa.Gov>

Like I said before, what ever is comfortable for you. If you have never used an iambic keyer (or any keyer for that matter), then it appears that the standard orientation is thumb for dots and index finger for dashes. I built a keyer 18 years ago and just happened to start using it in the opposite orientation, and now I would never be able to do it the "correct" way. Its just like the question "which way do you turn your head to take a breath while swimming?".

Date: 29 Nov 89 22:45:08 GMT
From: kg19+@andrew.cmu.edu (Kurt A. Geisel)
Subject: LISTENING BELONGS IN SWL
Message-ID: <oZR5joi00WB54AKMst@andrew.cmu.edu>

This clogging of listening and privacy discussion is another reason to start a SWL group. I never saw a vote for one. Is someone out there still trying to start one?

- Kurt

Kurt Geisel
Carnegie Mellon University
ARPA : kg19+@andrew.cmu.edu
UUCP : uunet!nfsun!kgeisel
BIX : kgeisel

SNAIL :
65 Lambeth Dr.
Pittsburgh, PA 15241
"I will not be pushed, filed, indexed, stamped,
briefed, debriefed, or numbered!" - The Prisoner


```

      !               +--+
      !               /~\ 20-volt zener
      !               /---\ 1 watt rating.
      !               !
      !               !
      !               +--+
SCR    |-----+-----|
100 volt / \
100amp  /-----\
        !         \100 ohms
        !         / 5 watt resistor
        !         !
----->to radio
```

Please use the following addresses for reply:	+ \\Natural
	+ \\Environment
JANET: PJML@UK.AC.NERC-WALLINGFORD.IBMA	+ \\Research
ARPA : PJML%IA.NWL.AC.UK@NSS.CS.UCL.AC.UK	+ \\Council
EARN : PJML%UK.AC.NWL.IA@UKACRL	+ NERC Computer Services
AX25 : G6WBJ {144.650MHz}	+ Holbrook House
SPAN : STAR::"PJML%IA.NWL.AC.UK@NSS.CS.UCL.AC.UK"	+ Station Road
PHONE: +44 793 411613	+ SWINDON SN1 1DE
FAX : +44 793 411503	+ GREAT BRITAIN

My standard advice is to order the 5 volume set of Title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Part 15 is in book 1 and part 97 is in book 5. They can be ordered from the U.S. Government printing office or some

such agency.

--Phil Howard, KA9WGN--
<phil@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

Date: 30 Nov 89 01:39:13 GMT
From: zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!samsung!cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!
ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!phil@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu
Subject: The "Right to Receive"
Message-ID: <30500309@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

> Note: we are way off ham-radio here. Please follow up by email...

...

> Again, please route any follow up comments by e-mail to att!mhgki!rma

I guess I will have to invade your right of privacy to get at all this interesting thread of conversation. I agree it's better in another newsgroup, so let's figure out where to move it. Maybe talk.politics or misc.legal?

--Phil Howard, KA9WGN--
<phil@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

Date: 27 Nov 89 17:07:28 GMT
From: cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!anasaz!qip!bobm@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Bob Maccione)
Subject: Weather Facsimile Reception
Message-ID: <1510@qip.UUCP>

My two cents on FAX stuff.

I just got into wefax reception. I had NO background with SW radios, antennas or any of that stuff. However so far everything is starting to come together pretty good. My setup is :

the radio - radioShak Dt440 or something like that. Cost ~ 200

the computer - either my AT or PC the pc has a CGA LCD which is pretty bad for viewing but when i get it battery powered it'll be fine for traveling.

The AT is a Herc card and makes great pic's.

The demodulator is from Software Systems Consulting(sp) in CA. They advertise in Pop Comm alot (at least the 3 issues I have) and it cost \$99 for the demodulator and software. The demodulator runs on the serial

port and the software runs under DOS.

My first antenna was the radio Shack long wire. From Phoenix I could get good pictures from San Fran. but not much else. I just bought a REAL antenna (name slips me at the moment) around 70 bucks and was tuned for the freq's I need.

Although I don't yet have a coax leadin from the antenna the pictures are MUCH better. I now can get Norfolk and Hawaii with no problem. The pics are great from CA and Norfolk although I still can't figgure out some of the Hawaii maps.

Currently I'm writing my own driver under QNX to allow me to capture maps and download them to other sites.

Well that's what I'm doing (sat pics will be later)

bob

Date: 30 Nov 89 01:32:28 GMT
From: dino!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!phil@uunet.uu.net
Subject: What's a good "FCC class B" PC/AT c
Message-ID: <30500306@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

> From: kaufman@Neon.Stanford.EDU
> In article <30500298@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu> phil@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu writes:
>
> >I recommend either using tightly shielded coax (meaning Belden 9913 or 9311)...
>
> Last I saw, 9913 was low loss, but not well shielded (something like 85-90%).
>
> For in-shack use, try RG-55 (RG-58 size) or RG-214 (RG-8 size). Both are
> double braid shields.
>
> Marc Kaufman (kaufman@Neon.stanford.edu)

Oh, now I guess we will start up into a "braid vs. foil" debate thread?

The radio theory I understand to be the case is that RF currents are ordinarily found on the INSIDE of the shield, but with braid, because there are some holes and because some conductors eventually make it to the OUTSIDE, then SOME of the current flows on the outside.

Braided coax is typically rated at 80-90% shielding (because it is 20-10% hole) and DOUBLE BRAIDED can be as good as 95-98% because there is yet

another braid layer (usually insulated from the first) that further isolates the inner conductor. However foil shielded coax where there is NO HOLES are typically rated with a shielding of 100% and the inner RF currents do not reach the outside except where breaks or flaws (such as at poor connectors like PL-259's) occur.

9913 is RG-8 size bonded foil shielded coax with a low density braid added for DC/ground draining. 9311 is RG-58 size foil shielded coax.

If you need references, I'll have to go look them up.

--Phil Howard, KA9WGN--
<phil@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #949
